

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Advisory Action dated March 22, 2005 and the final Office Action dated October 15, 2004 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 6, and 13 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,620). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single reference. That is, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Stated another way, the elements shown in the reference must be arranged as required by the claim.

Nevertheless, in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 60-67 and Figure 3B, item 12 (or BL) of Mizutani et al. as allegedly teaching "a backlight in a stand-by state during a responding period of the liquid crystal corresponding to each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals, for generating red, green, and blue light at the end of each responding period." Applicants, however, respectfully disagree.

Specifically, at column 8, lines 60-67, Mizutani et al. teaches:

Further, in this example, in each non-display state period (e.g., F12 or F22 in FIG. 3B), the backlight unit A was placed in a "(light-)OFF" state.

As a modification of this example, irrespective of the state ("ON" or "OFF") of the backlight unit A, it is possible to display a black (BL) state on the liquid crystal panel in each non-display state period.

That a backlight unit is placed in a light-OFF state in a non-display period does not teach, either expressly or inherently, that the backlight unit is placed in a non-display state during

a responding period that corresponds to data signals, as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that column 8, lines 60-67 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently “a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of a responding period of the liquid crystal corresponding to each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals, for generating red, green and blue light at the end of each responding period,” as presently recited in claim 1.

A close inspection of Figure 3B, in its entirety, also fails to provide any teaching, either express or inherent, of “a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of a responding period of the liquid crystal corresponding to each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals, for generating red, green and blue light at the end of each responding period,” as presently recited in claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit Mizutani et al. fails to anticipate at least claim 1. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In rejecting claim 6, the Examiner cites Figure 13 item illumination/transmitted light quantity, column 8, lines 35-44, and column 10, lines 33-53, Mizutani et al. as allegedly teaching “sequentially generating red, green, and blue light at the end of each responding period.” Again, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, at column 8, lines 35-44, Mizutani et al. teaches:

As described in the display operations for R-, G- and B-images (1) to (3), three primary color images (R, G, B) are successively displayed in a very short time period (i.e., F11 or F21 in FIG. 3B), whereby the resultant images remain in human eyes as an afterimage. As a result, the remaining R-, G-, B-images are visually overlapped to be recognized as a desired full-color image in a frame period (e.g., F1 or F2 in FIG. 3A).

In view of the actual teachings of Mizutani et al. cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that column 8, lines 35-44 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach “sequentially generating red, green, and blue light at the end of each responding period,” as asserted by the Examiner.

Similarly, at column 10, lines 33-53, Mizutani et al. teaches:

In the present invention, the liquid crystal device (panel) may most suitably be used as the optical modulation device for the display apparatus since the above-mentioned advantageous effects of the present invention can be achieved effectively.

As described hereinabove, according to the present invention, when a plurality of full-color images are successively visually recognized by the observer, a full-color display period (e.g., F11 shown in FIG. 3B wherein three primary color images (R, G and B) are successively displayed) and a subsequent full-color display period (e.g., F21) are separated timewise by an intervening non-display state period (e.g., F12) for ensuring a period of time sufficient to suppress or minimize the adverse influence of the previously displayed full-color image on the subsequent full-color image. The setting of the non-display state period is also effective in displaying motion picture image thus ensuring good image qualities while suppressing the above-mentioned color drift and image blur phenomenon.

In view of the actual teachings of Mizutani et al. cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that column 8, lines 35-44 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach "sequentially generating red, green, and blue light at the end of each responding period," as asserted by the Examiner.

While Figure 13 of Mizutani et al. illustrates an event that is labeled "LC RESPONSE," apparently aligned with an event labeled "ILLUMINATION LIGHT QUANTITY," Figure 13 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach "sequentially generating red, green, and blue light at the end of each responding period," as asserted by the Examiner. Indeed, even if "LC RESPONSE" is interpreted as reading on the claimed "responding period," Figure 13 of Mizutani et al. actually appears to teach generating red, green, and blue light during each responding period - not at the end of each responding period, as asserted by the Examiner.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 13, column 8, lines 35-44, and column 10, lines 33-53 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently "sequentially supplying red, green and blue data signals to a liquid crystal cell of a liquid crystal panel, wherein liquid crystal in the liquid crystal cell responds to each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals during a responding period for each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals; and sequentially generating red, green and blue light only at the end of each responding period," as presently recited in claim 6.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit Mizutani et al. fails to anticipate at least claim 6. Consequently Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In rejecting claim 13, the Examiner cites Figure 2 item A, Figure 3A item BL, column 8, lines 60-67, and column 10, lines 33-53 of Mizutani et al. as allegedly teaching “a backlight in a stand-by state during responding periods as the liquid crystal responds to the data signals after the data signals are supplied to the liquid crystal cells and generating light at the end of each responding period.” For reasons similar to those provided above, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, the disclosure within column 8, lines 60-67 and within column 10, lines 33-53 of Mizutani et al. is shown above. In view of the actual disclosures cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizutani et al. fails to teach or even suggest “a backlight in a stand-by state during responding periods as the liquid crystal responds to the data signals after the data signals are supplied to the liquid crystal cells and generating light at the end of each responding period,” as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that column 8, lines 60-67 and column 10, lines 33-53 of Mizutani et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently “a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of responding periods as the liquid crystal responds to the data signals after the data signals are supplied to the liquid crystal cells and generating light at the end of each responding period,” as presently recited in claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 3A of Mizutani et al. also fails to provide any teaching, express or inherent, of “a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of responding periods as the liquid crystal responds to the data signals after the data signals are supplied to the liquid crystal cells and generating light at the end of each responding period,” as presently recited in claim 13.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit Mizutani et al. fails to anticipate at least claim 13. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Mizutani et al. "anticipates the claimed invention" because "Mizutani teaches ... said backlight in a stand by state, figure 3B item BL or F12, wherein the backlight generates the color display in correspondence to the color signals, column 8, and column 10, lines 33-53."

Notwithstanding these noted teachings, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizutani et al. fails to teach everything that is presently recited in at least claims 1, 6, and 13. That is, Mizutani et al. fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, "a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of a responding period of the liquid crystal corresponding to each of said supplied red, green and blue data signals, for generating red, green and blue light at the end of each responding period, wherein the backlight generates the red, green and blue light in correspondence with the red, green and blue data signals," as recited in claim 1; "sequentially generating red, green and blue light only at the end of each responding period, wherein the red, green and blue light is generated in correspondence with the red, green and blue data signals," as recited in claim 6; and "a backlight in a stand-by state throughout the duration of responding periods as the liquid crystal responds to the data signals after the data signals are supplied to the liquid crystal cells and generating light at the end of each responding period," as recited in claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that the substance of much of the arguments presented above was submitted, for the first time, in the Amendment filed January 14, 2005. In the Advisory Action, however, the Examiner notes that these arguments "are not persuasive" because "Mizutani et al. reads on the applicants invention as claimed." As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f), where Applicants traverse any rejection, the Examiner should take note of and answer the substance of those arguments if the rejection is to be maintained. Applicants respectfully submit a conclusion that arguments are unpersuasive because "Mizutani et al. reads on the ... invention as claimed" does not answer the substance of Applicants arguments that were expressly based upon a detailed analysis of Mizutani et al. Thus, and in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f), Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to take note of and answer the substance of each and every argument presented above if the present rejections are to be maintained.

Claims 2-5, 7-12, and 14-21 variously depend from claims 1, 6, and 13. As shown above, Mizutani et al. fails to anticipate claims 1, 6, and 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully

submit that Mizutani et al. also fails to anticipate claims dependent claims 2-5, 7-12, and 14-21. Consequently, and for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kurt M. Eaton

Registration No.: 51,640

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant